

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/088,747	03/22/2002	Eric C. Edwards	17723-US-NP	8800
23553 7	590 10/25/2006		EXAMINER	
MARKS & CLERK			PIZIALI, JEFFREY J	
P.O. BOX 957		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
STATION B OTTAWA, ON K1P 5S7			2629	
CANADA			DATE MAILED: 10/25/2006	5

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

× 1 - 1			
		Application No.	Applicant(s)
Notice of Non-C	•	10/088,747	EDWARDS, ERIC C.
Amendment (37	CFR 1.121)	Examiner	Art Unit
The MAILING DATE of	Sabia a a manual a asia a a m	Jeff Piziali	2629
		pears on the cover sheet with the c	•
requirements of 37 CFR 1.121 of them(s) is required.	or 1.4. In order for the ar	considered non-compliant because mendment document to be compli	e it has failed to meet the lant, correction of the following
1. Amendments to the s			BE NON-COMPLIANT:
2. Abstract:	on a separate sheet. 3	7 CFR 1.72.	
✓ 3. Amendments to the of the drawings"Annotated Sh✓ B. The practice of the drawings	are not properly identificated as required by 37 of submitting proposed deaded figures, without materials.	ed in the top margin as "Replacen CFR 1.121(d). Irawing correction has been elimir arkings, in compliance with 37 CF	nated. Replacement drawings
☐ B. The listing of c ☐ C. Each claim ha of each claim number by usi (Previously pr	ting of all of the claims i claims does not include is not been provided wit cannot be identified. No ing one of the following esented), (New), (Not e	is not present. the text of all pending claims (inclent the proper status identifier, and ote: the status of every claim mustatus identifiers: (Original), (Currentered), (Withdrawn) and (Withdrawe not been presented in ascer	as such, the individual status st be indicated after its claim rently amended), (Canceled), awn-currently amended).
5. Other (e.g., the amer	ndment is unsigned or r	not signed in accordance with 37 (CFR 1.4):
For further explanation of the am	nendment format require	ed by 37 CFR 1.121, see MPEP §	714.
TIME PERIODS FOR FILING A	REPLY TO THIS NOTI	CE:	
 Applicant is given no new ti filed after allowance. If appl entire corrected amendme 	icant wishes to resubmi	ompliant amendment is an after-fii it the non-compliant after-final am l.	nal amendment or an amendment endment with corrections, the
correction, if the non-complia (including a submission for a amendment filed within a su	ant amendment is one of a request for continued of spension period under a ve boxes 1. to 4. are cho	whichever is longer, from the mail of the following: a preliminary ame examination (RCE) under 37 CFR 37 CFR 1.103(a) or (c), and an arecked, the correction required is cFR 1.121.	endment, a non-final amendment R 1.114), a supplemental mendment filed in response to a
Extensions of time are a amendment or an amend	available under 37 CFR ment filed in response t	1.136(a) <u>only</u> if the non-complian to a <i>Quayle</i> action.	t amendment is a non-final
filed in response to a (application if the non-co Quayle action; or	ult in: ompliant amendment is a non-fina oliant amendment is a preliminary	

Telephone No.

Continuation of 3(c) Other:

Firstly the applicant is graciously thanked for the 'Response' filed 10 August 2006; in particular, for the complimentary comments pertaining to the diligence of the earlier 'Notice of Non-Compliant Amendment' (mailed 11 July 2006) provided in the 'Remarks' section of said 'Response.' Unfortunately, several more seemingly non-compliant amendments have been discovered in the 'Response' filed 10 August 2006, requiring further attention before examination (including rejection and consideration of any submitted Information Disclosure Statements) may once again continue.

37 C.F.R. § 1.121(d) requires, "Any changes to an application drawing must be in compliance with § 1.84 and must be submitted on a replacement sheet of drawings which shall be an attachment to the amendment document and, in the top margin, labeled 'Replacement Sheet'. Any replacement sheet of drawings shall include all of the figures appearing on the immediate prior version of the sheet, even if only one figure is amended. Any new sheet of drawings containing an additional figure must be labeled in the top margin as 'New Sheet'. All changes to the drawings shall be explained, in detail, in either the drawing amendment or remarks section of the amendment paper."

In contrast, the 'Response' filed 10 August 2006 improperly seeks to amend the originally submitted label of Figure 3 from "Nominal display of image" to "NORMAL DISPLAY OF IMAGE," without explaining in detail in either the drawing amendment or remarks section of the amendment paper that such drawing changes are being made. The applicant is respectfully invited to explain whether this alteration constitutes yet another unintentional typographical error, or rather an intentional amendment to Figure 3's title.

The 'Response' filed 10 August 2006 states, "The Examiner was correct with regard to Figure 3b, in that the top of the image should coincide with the dashed line. This has been corrected. In Figure 3c, the solid line representing field of view should be a dashed line as was the case in the original Figure 3c, and this has also been corrected" (see Page 10, Paragraph 4).

However, contrary to the above remarks, Figure 3b (as submitted 10 August 2006) still does not illustrate the top of the image coinciding with the dashed line. Additionally, Figure 3c (as submitted 10 August 2006) still does not illustrate the field of view as a dashed line. In fact, despite the applicant's remarks to the contrary, both Figures 3b and 3c (as submitted 10 August 2006) look virtually no different than they did in the immediate previous non-compliant copy of the drawings (filed 24 April 2006). Despite the back-to-back repetition of these particular two issues of non-compliance, and although a more "pedantic" examiner might tend to disagree, this examiner considers the 'Response' filed 10 August 2006 to constitute a bona fide reply.

Please note: The amendments have not been checked to the extent necessary to determine the presence of all possible non-compliance errors. If additional issues of non-compliance are discovered at the time of a subsequent amendment, yet another Notice of Non-Compliant Amendment will be necessitated. Applicant's cooperation is respectfully requested in correcting any other errors of which applicant may become aware.

Jeff Piziali 20 October 2006